

1 BRETT A. SHUMATE
2 Assistant Attorney General
3 Civil Division
4 ERIC J. HAMILTON
5 Deputy Assistant Attorney General
6 JOSEPH E. BORSON
7 Assistant Branch Director
8 JASON ALTABET (Md. Bar No. 2211280012)
9 Trial Attorney, U.S. Department of Justice
10 Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
11 1100 L Street, N.W.
12 Washington, D.C. 20005
13 Tel.: (202) 305-0727
14 Email: Jason.k.altabet2@usdoj.gov
15 KATHRYN BARRAGAN (D.C. Bar No. 90026294)
16 Tel.: (202) 598-7696
17 Email: kathryn.e.barragan@usdoj.gov

18 *Attorneys for United States*

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
188

1 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

2	INTRODUCTION.....	1
3	STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES TO BE DECIDED.....	3
4	BACKGROUND	3
5	<i>Regulatory Background.....</i>	3
6	<i>Factual Background</i>	4
7	<i>Procedural Background.....</i>	5
8	ARGUMENT.....	7
9	I. This Court Should Reject Plaintiffs' Motion for the Reasons Previously Provided.....	7
10	II. Plaintiffs Have Not Met Their Burden for Provisional Class Certification Particularly for Any Grants Not Part of the July 31 NIH Suspension Action.....	11
11	A. Typicality, Adequacy, And Commonality Limit the Class Definition to NIH, not all of HHS	12
12	B. Typicality, Adequacy, and the Good Cause Finding for Modifying the Scheduling Order Limit the Class Definition to Just Grants Affected by the Suspension Letter	13
13	C. The NIH UCLA Suspension Action is Not Common or Typical with the Termination Actions at DoD and DoT	14
14	III. Even Under the Court's Prior Reasoning, NIH Should Not be Enjoined	16
15	A. The Form Termination Class Should Not Apply Here.....	17
16	<i>NIH's Suspension was Committed to Agency Discretion by Law.....</i>	17
17	<i>NIH's Suspension was not Arbitrary and Capricious.....</i>	19
18	B. NIH's Suspension is Also Outside the Equity Termination Class	20
19	<i>Plaintiffs Have Not Shown NIH's Actions Were Contrary to Law Under the APA.....</i>	20
20	<i>NIH's Letter Did Not Rely on DEIA-Related Executive Orders or Grant Content</i>	21
21	IV. Injunctive Relief Should Be Stayed Pending Appeal and Be Accompanied by a Bond	22
22	CONCLUSION	23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

3	<i>Agency for Int'l Dev. v. All. for Open Soc'y Int'l, Inc.</i> , ("USAID"), 570 U.S. 205 (2013).....	10
4		
5	<i>Am. Med. Ass'n v. Reno</i> , 57 F.3d 1129 (D.C. Cir. 1995).....	20
6		
7	<i>Betts v. Reliable Collection Agency, Ltd.</i> , 659 F.2d 1000 (9th Cir. 1981)	11
8		
9	<i>Bob Jones Univ. v. United States</i> , 461 U.S. 574, 604 (1983).....	16, 22
10		
11	<i>Califano v. Yamasaki</i> , 442 U.S. 682 (1979).....	10, 12
12		
13	<i>City of New Haven v. United States</i> , 809 F.2d 900 (D.C. Cir. 1987)	21
14		
15	<i>Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA</i> , 568 U.S. 398 (2013).....	8
16		
17	<i>Columbus Reg'l Hosp. v. United States</i> , 990 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	8
18		
19	<i>Dabney v. Reagan</i> , 542 F. Supp. 756 (S.D.N.Y. 1982).....	20
20		
21	<i>Dep't of Com. v. New York</i> , 588 U.S. 752 (2019).....	9
22		
23	<i>Dep't of Educ. v. California</i> , 145 S. Ct. 966 (2025).....	8, 10, 23
24		
25	<i>Faculty Senate of Fla. Int'l Univ. v. Winn</i> , 477 F. Supp. 2d 1198 (S.D. Fla. 2007)	10
26		
27	<i>FCC v. Prometheus Radio Project</i> , 592 U.S. 414 (2021).....	9, 19, 20
28		
	<i>FDA v. R. J. Reynolds Vapor Co.</i> , 145 S. Ct. 1984 (2025).....	8
	FED. DEFS.' OPP'N TO PLS.' MOT. FOR ADDITIONAL PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AS TO NIH CASE NO. 25-CV-4737	

1	<i>Glob. Health Council v. Trump</i> , No. 25-5097, 2025 WL 2480618 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 28, 2025).....	12
2		
3	<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998)	11
4		
5	<i>Heckler v. Chaney</i> , 470 U.S. 821 (1985).....	17
6		
7	<i>Klamath Water Users Protective Ass'n v. Patterson</i> , 204 F.3d 1206 (9th Cir. 1999)	8
8		
9	<i>Kowalski v. Tesmer</i> , 543 U.S. 125 (2004).....	8, 22, 23
10		
11	<i>Lincoln v. Vigil</i> , 508 U.S. 182 (1993).....	17, 18, 19
12		
13	<i>Louisiana v. Biden</i> , 64 F.4th 674 (5th Cir. 2023)	9
14		
15	<i>Megapulse v. Lewis</i> , 672 F.2d 959 (D.C. Cir. 1982).....	7
16		
17	<i>Milk Train, Inc. v. Veneman</i> , 310 F.3d 747 (D.C. Cir. 2002)	17
18		
19	<i>Mobil Oil Expl. & Producing Se. Inc. v. United Distrib. Cos.</i> , 498 U.S. 211 (1991).....	9
20		
21	<i>Murthy v. Missouri</i> , 603 U.S. 43 (2024).....	8
22		
23	<i>NIH v. Am. Pub. Health Ass'n</i> , No. 25A103, 2025 WL 2415669 (U.S. Aug. 21, 2025).....	7
24		
25	<i>Rust v. Sullivan</i> , 500 U.S. 173 (1991).....	9, 10
26		
27		
28	<i>Rutledge v. Elec. Hose & Rubber Co.</i> , 511 F.2d 668 (9th Cir. 1975)	11
29		
30	<i>Sampson v. Murray</i> , 415 U.S. 61 (1974).....	10
31		
32	FED. DEFS.' OPP'N TO PLS.' MOT. FOR ADDITIONAL PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AS TO NIH CASE NO. 25-CV-4737	

1	<i>Savantage Fin. Servs., Inc. v. United States</i> , 595 F.3d 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	9
2		
3	<i>Simon v. E. Ky. Welfare Rts. Org.</i> , 426 U.S. 26 (1976).....	8
4		
5	<i>Small v. Allianz Life Ins. Co. of N. Am.</i> , 122 F.4th 1182 (9th Cir. 2024)), cert. denied, No. 24-1225, 2025 WL 1787755 (U.S. June 30, 2025)	11
6		
7	<i>Smiley v. Citibank (S. Dakota)</i> , 517 U.S. 735 (1996).....	20
8		
9	<i>Sueoka v. United States</i> , 101 F. App'x 649 (9th Cir. 2004)	11
10		
11	<i>Tennessee v. Becerra</i> , 131 F.4th 350 (6th Cir. 2025)	9
12		
13	<i>Trump v. Boyle</i> , No. 25A11, 2025 WL 2056889 (U.S. July 23, 2025)	10, 11
14		
15	<i>Trump v. Sierra Club</i> , 140 S. Ct. 1 (2019).....	20, 21
16		
17	<i>Tucson Airport Authority v. General Dynamic</i> ., 136 F.3d 641 (9th Cir. 1998)	7, 8
18		
19	<i>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes</i> , 564 U.S. 338 (2011).....	11
20		
21	<i>Wolin v. Jaguar Land Rover N. Am., LLC</i> , 617 F.3d 1168 (9th Cir. 2010)	12, 13
22		
23	<u>Statutes</u>	
24	2 U.S.C. § 683.....	20
25		
26	5 U.S.C. § 701.....	17
27		
28	5 U.S.C. § 702.....	17
	FED. DEFS.' OPP'N TO PLS.' MOT. FOR ADDITIONAL PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AS TO NIH CASE NO. 25-CV-4737	

1	31 U.S.C. § 503.....	4
2	31 U.S.C. § 6307.....	4
3	42 U.S.C. § 241.....	17, 18
4	42 U.S.C. § 282.....	18, 21
5	42 U.S.C. § 284.....	17, 18
6	Full-Year Continuing Appropriations and Extensions Act, 2025, Pub. L. No. 119-4, 139 Stat. 11 (2025).....	18
7		
8	Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024, Pub. L. No. 118-47, Div. D, Tit. II, 138 Stat. 656 (2024).....	18
9		

Rules

10	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23	11
11	Fed. R. Civ. P. 65.....	23

Regulations

12	2 C.F.R. Part 200	3, 4
13	2 C.F.R. § 200.309.....	4
14	2 C.F.R. § 200.339.....	4
15	2 C.F.R. § 200.340.....	4, 5, 18
16	2 C.F.R. § 200.343.....	4
17	45 C.F.R. § 75.371	4, 18, 19
18		
19	Exec. Order No. 14,151, 90 Fed. Reg. 8339 (Jan. 20, 2025).....	6, 15
20		
21	Exec. Order No. 14,173, 90 Fed. Reg. 8633 (Jan. 21, 2025).....	6, 15
22		

Other Authorities

23	H.R. Rep. No. 658, 93-658, 93d Cong., 1st Sess. (1971), <i>reprinted in</i> 1974 U.S.C. Cong. & Admin. News 3462	21
24		
25		
26	FED. DEFS.' OPP'N TO PLS.' MOT. FOR ADDITIONAL PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AS TO NIH CASE NO. 25-CV-4737	

1	HHS Agencies & Offices, https://www.hhs.gov/about/agencies/hhs-agencies-and-offices/index.html (last visited Sep. 10, 2025)	1
2	
3		
4	The Department of Justice's July 29 press release, https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-finds-university-california-los-angeles-violation-federal-civil-rights (last visited Sep. 9, 2025)	4
5	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	FED. DEFS.' OPP'N TO PLS.' MOT. FOR ADDITIONAL PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AS TO NIH CASE NO. 25-CV-4737	

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Several months ago, this Court preliminarily enjoined three federal agencies, requiring them to
 3 restore certain terminated grants where University of California (“UC”) affiliated researchers were listed
 4 on the grant application in certain positions and issuing prospective relief for certain future terminations.
 5 The Court provisionally certified two classes—the Form Termination Class and Equity Termination
 6 Class—with criteria for when a termination qualifies under either. The Court did not extend relief to
 7 agencies where a named plaintiff was not named on a grant, and the Court rejected relief based on separate
 8 executive priorities irrelevant to the named plaintiffs’ grants. Ultimately, the Court enjoined three agencies
 9 based on the content and form of their termination letters and for terminations pursuant to two DEI-related
 10 Executive Orders. Then, on an agreed schedule, Plaintiffs amended their complaint to add two additional
 11 named plaintiffs named on grant applications with the Department of Defense (“DoD”) and Department
 12 of Transportation (“DoT”).

13 However, on the evening of August 21, 2025, Plaintiffs filed a letter brief raising to the Court, for
 14 the first time, that Plaintiffs planned to further amend their complaint to add named plaintiffs for the
 15 National Institutes of Health (“NIH”). ECF No. 102. The letter came nearly three weeks after NIH
 16 suspended grants to the University of California - Los Angeles (“UCLA”) based on findings regarding
 17 that grantee’s conduct. The Court treated Plaintiffs’ letter brief as a motion to modify the Court’s
 18 scheduling order and granted their request to further amend their complaint. The Court permitted that
 19 amendment because “these are three new plaintiffs who are alleging injuries that occurred after the
 20 deadline for amended pleadings had passed, [so] it does not seem to me that [Plaintiffs] could have
 21 anticipated what the form letter would have looked like in advance.” Trans. (Aug. 26, 2025) 20:13-20:17.
 22 Plaintiffs have since moved to expand their proposed preliminary injunction for DoD and DoT to cover
 23 not just NIH, but the entire Department of Health and Human Services (“HHS”).¹

24

25 ¹ This includes over a dozen operating divisions and sub-agencies with grantmaking functions for
 26 which Plaintiffs have made no showing and have never mentioned. *See* HHS Agencies & Offices,
 27 <https://www.hhs.gov/about/agencies/hhs-agencies-and-offices/index.html> (last visited Sep. 10, 2025)
 28 (identifying various HHS components such as the Administration for Children and Families (ACF),
 Administration for Community Living (ACL), Advanced Research Projects Agency for Health (ARPAH-H),
 Administration for Strategic Preparedness and Response (ASPR), Assistant Secretary for Health
 (ASH), Indian Health Service (IHS), Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
 FED. DEFS.’ OPP’N TO PLS.’ MOT. FOR ADDITIONAL PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AS TO NIH
 CASE NO. 25-CV-4737

1 The Court should reject Plaintiffs' motion or limit it to NIH in line with its ruling authorizing
 2 amendment of the complaint. To start, Defendants reiterate and preserve the arguments made in their initial
 3 briefing that the Court should not have issued a preliminary injunction and should similarly refrain from
 4 doing so here—including their arguments set forth in supplemental briefing. *See* ECF Nos. 25, 122. But
 5 even if the Court maintains its previous reasoning, Defendants raise application-specific reasons the Court
 6 should not issue an injunction.

7 First, Plaintiffs do not satisfy multiple class action requirements. The NIH suspension action does
 8 not satisfy commonality, and the named plaintiffs are not typical. Even if this Court grants a provisional
 9 class, the Court should at the very least limit the class in two ways. It should reject Plaintiffs' attempt to
 10 subject all of HHS to an injunction based on only named NIH plaintiffs. Moreover, the NIH portion of the
 11 class should be limited to only those researchers listed on grants that were part of the suspension action
 12 that Plaintiffs selected as the basis for modifying the scheduling order—the July 31 letter from NIH.
 13 Finally, Defendants renew their objection that a suspension is not a termination and therefore cannot fall
 14 within the Form Termination Class.

15 Nor are Plaintiffs likely to succeed on the merits. As to the Form Termination Class, the statutory
 16 scheme setting out grant funding for NIH commits funding, suspension, and termination decisions to the
 17 agency's discretion by law. Administrative Procedure Act ("APA") review is thus not available. If the
 18 Court reaches the merits, the suspension letter sent by NIH is sufficiently detailed.

19 Finally, as to the Equity Termination Class, if APA review applies, the statutory scheme governing
 20 NIH does not bar suspension of ongoing grants. Assuming the Court maintains a First Amendment basis
 21 for the class criteria, it should still be applied sparingly. Here, Plaintiffs have not shown that the NIH
 22 suspension was premised on the DEIA content of any grant.

23 In sum, even assuming the Court maintains its original reasoning, it should still deny Plaintiffs'
 24 motion or limit the resulting preliminary injunction to only cover grants suspended in the July 31 action
 25 by NIH.

26
 27
 28 (SAMHSA), and Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR)).

FED. DEF'S. OPP'N TO PLS.' MOT. FOR ADDITIONAL PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AS TO NIH
 CASE NO. 25-CV-4737

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES TO BE DECIDED

1. Should the Court issue a preliminary injunction despite the renewed jurisdictional, merits, and class certification arguments made by Defendants, including based on the recent Supreme Court decision barring district court litigation involving research-related grant terminations?
2. Have Plaintiffs successfully established the requirements of provisional class certification given the uniqueness of the NIH suspension action?
3. Even if the NIH suspension action qualifies, should the Court limit the class definition to only the NIH suspension action—instead of HHS generally (and its over a dozen grantmaking components), or prior NIH terminations—given that Plaintiffs’ basis for modifying the scheduling order was the July 31 NIH suspension action?

Assuming the Court concludes provisional certification is proper and maintains the reasoning underlying its preliminary injunction:

4. For the Form Termination Class, which is premised on APA review, were NIH's actions committed to agency discretion by law such that APA review is barred? If APA review is allowed, was NIH's suspension letter sufficient to exclude the action from the Form Termination Class?
5. If APA review applies, does the statutory scheme governing NIH require grant funding to remain frozen in place regardless of developments? And should the Court expand the Equity Termination Class to cover the NIH suspension action where the letter explains that NIH acted based on UCLA's conduct, not the content of any individual grant, nor any DEIA-related Executive Order?

BACKGROUND

The background of this matter is little changed from when the Court issued its preliminary injunction. Preliminary Injunction, ECF No. 55.

Regulatory Background

Agencies are broadly empowered, through terms and conditions of federal grants and associated

1 regulations and guidance, to reorient grant portfolios in response to changing priorities. As a default
2 matter, Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) regulations generally govern a variety of terms for
3 federal grants and contracts. *See generally* 2 C.F.R. Part 200 (titled “Uniform Administrative
4 Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards”). For example, the
5 regulations reference and generally provide terms for the suspension or termination of awarded federal
6 grants. *See, e.g., id.* § 200.309 (“If termination occurs, the period of performance will be amended to end
7 upon the effective date of termination.”); *id.* § 200.339(c) (noting suspension or termination is a remedy
8 for noncompliance); *id.* § 200.343 (discussing the effects of suspension or termination).

9 Section 200.340 preserves agencies' ability to, "pursuant to the terms and conditions of the Federal
10 award," terminate existing grants "including, to the extent authorized by law, if an award no longer
11 effectuates the program goals or agency priorities." *Id.* § 200.340(a)(4). This authority has been
12 promulgated consistent with Congressional directives delegating to OMB the power to manage various
13 aspects of federal grants and contracts. *See* 31 U.S.C. § 503; *id.* § 6307. Awardees are accordingly
14 informed in their terms and conditions that funding may be cut off based on changes in agency priorities.

15 HHS regulations further detail remedies for noncompliance with “Federal statutes, regulations, or
16 the terms and conditions of a Federal award.” 45 C.F.R. § 75.371. They also explain how a suspension
17 operates. If a component of HHS, like NIH, determined that a grantee is not in compliance with statutes,
18 regulations, or terms and conditions, it may take a variety of corrective actions. *Id.* As relevant here, the
19 regulations authorize NIH to “[w]holly or partly suspend (suspension of award activities) or terminate the
20 Federal award.” *Id.* § 75.371(c).

Factual Background

22 In a letter dated July 31, 2025, NIH informed UCLA that it would be suspending various grants to
23 the university after findings by the Department of Justice that UCLA violated federal civil rights law.² Ex.
24 A (“NIH Suspension Letter”), ECF No. 118-1. The suspension letter made detailed factual findings
25 specific to UCLA, and informed the institution that NIH was willing to work with UCLA to resolve these

² The Department of Justice's July 29 press release is located at <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-finds-university-california-los-angeles-violation-federal-civil-rights> (last visited Sep. 9, 2025).

1 concerns and facilitate corrective action. The letter identified several “specific examples of
 2 noncompliance”: (1) “illegal race-based preferences in admissions practices;” (2) “fail[ure] to promote a
 3 research environment free of antisemitism and bias;” and (3) “discriminat[ion] against and endanger[ing]
 4 women by allowing men in women’s sports and private women-only spaces.” *Id.* NIH dedicated a
 5 paragraph to each identified example of noncompliance with cited sources. *Id.* at 1-3. For example, NIH
 6 cited “UCLA’s own Task Force to Combat Antisemitism and Anti-Israeli Bias” which, NIH explained,
 7 “revealed that Jewish students, faculty, and staff were subjected to threats, assaults, swastika graffiti, and
 8 hostile slogans during the 2024 pro-Palestinian encampment.” *Id.* at 2. As to reliance interests, NIH stated
 9 that it “has considered UCLA’s reliance interests in continued availability of funding under the attached
 10 list of grants, and they are outweighed by the concerns identified.” *Id.* at 3.

11 NIH stated its “willing[ness] to work with UCLA to identify corrective actions to bring UCLA
 12 into compliance.” *Id.* To that end, it requested a “written corrective action plan.” *Id.* NIH closed by
 13 explaining “that under 2 CFR § 200.340, NIH may move to terminate an award for reasons including if
 14 the recipient has failed to comply with the terms and conditions of an award.” *Id.* The letter did not cite
 15 any Executive Order.

16 Plaintiffs additionally claim that NIH issued “form termination letters to UC researchers” but has
 17 not identified any named plaintiffs who received such a letter, nor provided any allegations related to a
 18 specific researcher’s termination. *See Mot. For Preliminary Injunction and Provisional Class Cert.* as to
 19 HHS/NIH (“3rd PI Mot.”) at 4-5, ECF No. 117.

20 *Procedural Background*

21 On June 5, 2025, Plaintiffs filed this suit naming 16 grantmaking agencies as defendants, moved
 22 for a temporary restraining order, and sought to certify a class. Compl., ECF No. 1; Pls.’ Mem. in Supp.
 23 of Mot. for TRO, (“Pls.’ PI Mem.”), ECF No. 7-1; Pls.’ Mot. for Class Certification, ECF No. 18. In their
 24 emergency motion, Plaintiffs sought the restoration of terminated grant funding, a bar on future
 25 terminations, and a judicial order reinstating pre-January 20, 2025 grant termination procedures. Pls.’ PI
 26 Mem. at 2. The Court subsequently set briefing on both motions with a hearing on June 20. ECF No. 28.

27 After a hearing, the Court granted preliminary injunctive relief but limited both the scope and
 28

1 reach. The preliminary injunction is limited to only those agencies where named plaintiffs were listed “as
 2 principal researchers, investigators, or project leaders on the grant applications for previously awarded
 3 research grants,” Preliminary Injunction ¶¶ 1, 3, namely the Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”),
 4 National Science Foundation (“NSF”), and National Endowment for the Humanities (“NEH”).

5 As to those three agencies, the Court certified two classes. The Equity Termination Class, based
 6 on Plaintiffs’ First Amendment claim, and part of their APA contrary to law claim, covers “grants
 7 terminated by Agency Defendants pursuant to Executive Orders 14151 or 14173.” *Id.* ¶ 4a. The Form
 8 Termination Class, based on Plaintiffs’ arbitrary and capricious claim under the APA, covers “grant
 9 terminations . . . communicated by means of a form termination notice that does not provide a grant-
 10 specific explanation for the termination that states the reason for the change to the original award decision
 11 and considers the reliance interests at stake.” *Id.* ¶ 2a. The Court also explained the basis for its injunction
 12 and provisional class certification. Order Granting Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Class
 13 Certification (“Mem. Op.”), ECF No. 54.

14 After the Court issued its preliminary injunction, the parties conferred on a schedule for further
 15 proceedings. Joint Case Management Statement, ECF No. 58. The parties agreed that Plaintiffs would
 16 amend their complaint to add additional named plaintiffs and then move to expand the scope of the Court’s
 17 preliminary injunction. *Id.* at 2. Plaintiffs subsequently amended their complaint to include two additional
 18 plaintiffs. Am. Compl., ECF No. 68. Plaintiffs then moved for an additional preliminary injunction for
 19 DoD and DoT. Mot. for Preliminary Injunction & Provisional Class Certification as to Additional Agency
 20 Defendants (“2nd PI Mot.”), ECF No. 76. That motion is fully briefed.

21 The Court subsequently permitted Plaintiffs to modify the scheduling order. Plaintiffs filed an
 22 additional amended complaint with three named plaintiffs listed on NIH grants that were suspended
 23 through the NIH Suspension Letter. 2nd Am. Compl., ECF No. 112. Plaintiffs then filed a motion to
 24 include HHS as a whole and the sub-agency NIH as part of the injunction. 3rd PI Mot. at 10. Moreover,
 25 both parties have filed supplemental briefing on the effect of recent decisions on the issues here—
 26 particularly the Tucker Act preclusion arguments. ECF Nos. 121, 122. Finally, the Parties filed a
 27 stipulation and proposed order, which the Court has adopted, for further proceedings—including the

1 production of an administrative record by “NIH.” ECF Nos. 123, 125.

2 **ARGUMENT**

3 Plaintiffs seek to enjoin all of HHS based on the July 31 NIH suspension action. Defendants
 4 maintain their original objections to a preliminary injunction in its entirety, including that Plaintiffs’
 5 alleged irreparable harm and the balance of the equities do not support emergency injunctive relief—
 6 especially after the Supreme Court’s recent ruling. *NIH v. Am. Pub. Health Ass’n*, No. 25A103, 2025 WL
 7 2415669, at *1 (U.S. Aug. 21, 2025).

8 Even if the Court maintains the reasoning underlying its first preliminary injunction, the Court
 9 should still deny Plaintiffs’ third motion, or limit it only to NIH grants affected by the July 31 suspension
 10 action, as detailed below.

11 **I. This Court Should Reject Plaintiffs’ Motion for the Reasons Previously Provided**

12 As an initial matter, Defendants renew, preserve, and expand on the arguments that the Court
 13 previously considered.

14 First, this Court lacks jurisdiction over each claim—and particularly the APA claims—because
 15 Congress has specifically divested federal courts of jurisdiction over matters like this one. Were there any
 16 doubt, the Supreme Court’s recent *NIH* decision forecloses any lingering arguments against this approach
 17 for the reasons provided in Defendants’ supplemental brief. ECF No. 122.

18 Under the test laid out in *Megapulse v. Lewis*, 672 F.2d 959, 968 (D.C. Cir. 1982), and regularly
 19 applied by the Ninth Circuit, *Tucson Airport Authority v. General Dynamic.*, 136 F.3d 641, 647 (9th Cir.
 20 1998), Plaintiffs may not bypass the Court of Federal Claims through clever pleading. If “a particular
 21 action” is “at its essence a contract action” it is not within the jurisdiction of the district courts—a test that
 22 requires looking at both “the source of the rights upon which the plaintiff bases its claims” and “the type
 23 of relief sought (or appropriate).” *Megapulse*, 672 F.2d at 968 (citation omitted). Plaintiffs’ claims are
 24 ultimately based on grant agreements themselves, and a claim-by-claim analysis shows each would fail
 25 without the terms of the grant agreements. As *Megapulse* explained, “[i]t is hard to conceive of a claim
 26 falling no matter how squarely within the Tucker Act which could not be urged to involve as well agency
 27 error subject to review under the APA.” 672 F.2d at 967 n.34 (citation omitted). And the APA arbitrary

1 and capricious claim here is materially identical to a claim that a contracting party failed to properly
 2 terminate a contract. As to relief, that the order is ultimately one to “enforce [the Government’s]
 3 contractual obligation to pay money” means the relief prong of the *Megapulse* test divests the court of
 4 jurisdiction. The Supreme Court has recently emphasized as much. *See Dep’t of Educ. v. California*, 145
 5 S. Ct. 966, 968 (2025) (per curiam) (citation omitted). In sum, the Ninth Circuit takes a strong view of
 6 preclusion, even holding “that the Tucker Act prevents constitutional claims that are dependent on rights
 7 under a government contract,” *Tucson Airport Auth.*, 136 F.3d at 648, and such reasoning applies here.

8 It does not matter whether these specific plaintiffs could bring a claim in the Court of Federal
 9 Claims. Plaintiffs “conflate[] two distinct concepts . . . the presence or absence of an adequate remedy
 10 within the meaning of § 704, and the requirement that a cause of action not be ‘impliedly forbidden’ under
 11 § 702.” *Id.* at 646. When Congress creates a “cause of action enabling [some parties] (and not [others]) to
 12 seek judicial review . . . [a]llowing [the others] to sue under the APA would . . . frustrat[e] that scheme.”
 13 *FDA v. R. J. Reynolds Vapor Co.*, 145 S. Ct. 1984, 1995 n.8 (2025). And under Federal Circuit law, these
 14 are indeed contracts enforceable in the Court of Federal Claims. *Columbus Reg’l Hosp. v. United States*,
 15 990 F.3d 1330, 1338 (Fed. Cir. 2021) (“[W]e have followed our predecessor court in treating federal grant
 16 agreements as contracts when the standard conditions for a contract are satisfied.”).

17 Second, Plaintiffs lack standing because they are not parties to the contracts they seek to enforce.
 18 It is well established that each party generally “must assert his own legal rights” and may not invoke the
 19 rights of “third parties.” *Kowalski v. Tesmer*, 543 U.S. 125, 129 (2004). Yet Plaintiffs’ claims and relief
 20 are entirely premised on requiring the Federal Government to continue paying contractual obligations to
 21 nonparties. Plaintiffs would lose on the merits because they lack third-party beneficiary status, *see*
 22 *Klamath Water Users Protective Ass’n v. Patterson*, 204 F.3d 1206, 1210 (9th Cir. 1999), nor can they
 23 assert third-party standing, *see Kowalski*, 543 U.S. at 129-30. The fact that Plaintiffs require the Court to
 24 assume “how independent decisionmakers will exercise their judgment” defeats redressability, *see Murthy*
 25 *v. Missouri*, 603 U.S. 43, 57 (2024) (citation omitted), and causation is lacking because a Court order
 26 merely encourages third parties to eventually remedy Plaintiffs’ alleged harms, *see Simon v. E. Ky.*
 27 *Welfare Rts. Org.*, 426 U.S. 26, 41-43 (1976). Finally, enjoining future alleged terminations is too

1 speculative to support standing. *See Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, 568 U.S. 398, 409 (2013) (explaining
 2 that any allegation of “threatened injury must be *certainly impending*” (citation omitted)).

3 Third, Plaintiffs’ APA claims are foreclosed for lack of final agency action. While each individual
 4 termination may eventually represent a final agency action (directed at nonparties) a plaintiff may not “in
 5 a single swipe at the duly elected executive” seek judicial superintendence over the entire grantmaking
 6 structure of the Executive Branch. *See Louisiana v. Biden*, 64 F.4th 674, 684 (5th Cir. 2023). Plaintiffs’
 7 attempt to categorically enjoin alleged future terminations is thus barred.

8 Fourth, on the merits of the APA arbitrary and capricious claim, such review is deferential because
 9 it “represents a substantial intrusion into the workings of another branch of Government.” *See Dep’t of*
 10 *Com. v. New York*, 588 U.S. 752, 781 (2019) (quotation marks omitted); *see also Savantage Fin. Servs.,*
 11 *Inc. v. United States*, 595 F.3d 1282, 1286 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (“[D]etermining an agency’s minimum needs
 12 is a matter within the broad discretion of agency officials . . . and is not for [the] court to second guess.”
 13 (quotations omitted)). The suspension was “reasonable and reasonably explained.” *FCC v. Prometheus*
 14 *Radio Project*, 592 U.S. 414, 423 (2021). And it is exceedingly unlikely that anyone has a reliance interest
 15 in continued discretionary funding—particularly when the agency communications themselves recognize
 16 funding may not continue in future years despite initial funding. *See Tennessee v. Becerra*, 131 F.4th 350,
 17 370 (6th Cir. 2025) (“Tennessee likely has no legally cognizable reliance interest in the receipt of a
 18 discretionary funding award on the conditions that it prefers.” (emphasis removed)). Reliance interests
 19 therefore do not weigh in favor of preliminary injunctive relief. The APA does not require Defendants to
 20 simply maintain grants that no longer effectuate their priorities and forego a regulatorily permitted
 21 termination pathway. *See, e.g., Mobil Oil Expl. & Producing Se. Inc. v. United Distrib. Cos.*, 498 U.S.
 22 211, 230 (1991) (“An agency enjoys broad discretion in determining how best to handle related, yet
 23 discrete, issues in terms of procedures, and priorities[.]” (citations omitted)).

24 Fifth, Plaintiffs’ First Amendment argument directly contradicts longstanding precedent on when
 25 viewpoint discrimination is impermissible in government grantmaking. In short, Government spending is
 26 not subject to traditional First Amendment scrutiny. “The Government can, without violating the
 27 Constitution, selectively fund a program to encourage certain activities it believes to be in the public
 28

1 interest.” *Rust v. Sullivan*, 500 U.S. 173, 193 (1991). That is not considered impermissible viewpoint
 2 discrimination. Indeed, “[i]n so doing, the Government has not discriminated on the basis of viewpoint; it
 3 has merely chosen to fund one activity to the exclusion of the other.” *Id.* So “[a]s a general matter, if a
 4 party objects to a condition on the receipt of federal funding, its recourse is to decline the funds. This
 5 remains true when the objection is that a condition may affect the recipient’s exercise of its First
 6 Amendment rights.” *Agency for Int’l Dev. v. All. for Open Soc’y Int’l, Inc.* (“USAID”), 570 U.S. 205, 214
 7 (2013) (emphasis added). At the very least, a person merely listed as a researcher on a grant application
 8 has no personal First Amendment right to bar the Government from affecting someone else’s grant. Any
 9 First Amendment right, if it were to exist, would belong to the grantee itself, who is not a party in this
 10 matter.

11 Finally, irreparable harm and the balance of the equities counsel against issuing an additional
 12 injunction. “[I]njunctive relief should be no more burdensome to the defendant than necessary to provide
 13 complete relief to the plaintiffs” before the court. *Califano v. Yamasaki*, 442 U.S. 682, 702 (1979). And
 14 “mere injuries, however substantial, in terms of money, time and energy necessarily expended . . . are not
 15 enough.” *See Sampson v. Murray*, 415 U.S. 61, 90 (1974); *see also Faculty Senate of Fla. Int’l Univ. v.*
 16 *Winn*, 477 F. Supp. 2d 1198, 1208 (S.D. Fla. 2007) (“There is no irreparable harm here because the
 17 plaintiffs can fund the desired travel themselves and then, if they prevail in this suit, obtain reimbursement.
 18 In other words, the harm is financial.”). Plaintiffs’ alleged harms are necessarily financial and insufficient
 19 for irreparable harm. Indeed, they are reparable in the Court of Federal Claims.

20 As for the balance of the equities, the Supreme Court in *California* squarely explained that it favors
 21 the Federal Government in this context. The public interest is harmed when the United States is forced to
 22 pay out funds that it may not be able to recover. *California*, 145 S. Ct. at 969. And grantees can choose
 23 whether “to keep the programs operating,” and if they choose not to, “then any ensuing irreparable harm
 24 would be of their own making.” *Id.* The Court recently clarified that such reasoning is binding on the
 25 lower courts. *Trump v. Boyle*, No. 25A11, 2025 WL 2056889 (U.S. July 23, 2025) (“Although our interim
 26 orders are not conclusive as to the merits, they inform how a court should exercise its equitable discretion
 27 in like cases.”). And the *NIH* case entirely forecloses Plaintiffs’ contrary arguments, as Defendants
 28

1 explained in their supplemental brief. ECF No. 122.

2 **II. Plaintiffs Have Not Met Their Burden for Provisional Class Certification Particularly for**
 3 **Any Grants Not Part of the July 31 NIH Suspension Action**

4 Plaintiffs do not satisfy the requirements for provisional class certification as to NIH. Critically,
 5 “plaintiffs must actually prove—not simply plead—that their proposed class satisfies each requirement of
 6 Rule 23 by a preponderance of the evidence.” *Small v. Allianz Life Ins. Co. of N. Am.*, 122 F.4th 1182,
 7 1197 (9th Cir. 2024) (internal quotation marks omitted), *cert. denied*, No. 24-1225, 2025 WL 1787755
 8 (U.S. June 30, 2025). This is “a rigorous analysis.” *Id.* (quotation omitted). And the failure to meet “any
 9 one of Rule 23’s requirements destroys the alleged class action.” *Rutledge v. Elec. Hose & Rubber Co.*,
 10 511 F.2d 668, 673 (9th Cir. 1975).

11 Plaintiffs ask the Court to certify two new provisional classes. 3rd PI Mot. at 10. Each class must
 12 meet the requirements of Rule 23. Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) (defining the requirements as to “the class”). And
 13 even if the Court were to consider these as subclasses, the Ninth Circuit is clear: “each subclass must
 14 independently meet the requirements of Rule 23 for the maintenance of a class action.” *Betts v. Reliable*
 15 *Collection Agency, Ltd.*, 659 F.2d 1000, 1005 (9th Cir. 1981); *accord Sueoka v. United States*, 101 F.
 16 App’x 649, 652 (9th Cir. 2004) (unpublished).

17 Rule 23(a)’s commonality and typicality requirements are interrelated and, in some instances,
 18 merge. *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes*, 564 U.S. 338, 349 n.5 (2011). Commonality requires that “claims
 19 must depend upon a common contention . . . of such a nature that it is capable of classwide resolution.”
 20 *Id.* at 350. Typicality focuses on how the named plaintiffs’ claims relate to those of the potential class
 21 members. *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1020 (9th Cir. 1998). In sum, “[b]oth [requirements]
 22 serve as guideposts for determining whether under the particular circumstances maintenance of a class
 23 action is economical and whether the named plaintiff’s claim and the class claims are so interrelated that
 24 the interests of the class members will be fairly and adequately protected in their absence.” *Dukes*, 564
 25 U.S. at 349 n.5.

26 Commonality bars a class definition when “differences in the factual background of each claim
 27 will affect the outcome of the legal issue.” *Califano v. Yamasaki*, 442 U.S. 682, 701 (1979). Meanwhile,
 28

1 “the test of typicality is whether other members have the same or similar injury, whether the action is
 2 based on conduct which is not unique to the named plaintiffs, and whether other class members have been
 3 injured by the same course of conduct.” *Wolin v. Jaguar Land Rover N. Am., LLC*, 617 F.3d 1168, 1175
 4 (9th Cir. 2010) (citation omitted). Adequacy requires named plaintiffs to “fairly and adequately protect
 5 the interests of the class without a conflict of interest with the absent class members.” Mem. Op. at 56
 6 (quoting *Yates v. NewRez LLC*, 686 F. Supp. 3d 397, 405 (D. Md. 2023)) (cleaned up).

7 These principles bar, at the very least, inclusion of the entirety of HHS (as opposed to just NIH)
 8 in the class definition, as well as NIH terminations (as opposed to suspensions based on the July 31 letter).
 9 Moreover, the UCLA suspension action is so distinct from the terminations by other agencies that the
 10 Court should also find that Plaintiffs have not shown commonality and typicality.

11 **A. Typicality, Adequacy, And Commonality Limit the Class Definition to NIH, not all of
 12 HHS**

13 First, for the reasons this Court previously laid out, only NIH should be part of any class definition
 14 here.

15 As the Court recognized in its original order, a class cannot be certified using broad strokes
 16 disconnected from the situation of any named plaintiff. Mem. Op. at 51-53, 59-60. The Court thus rejected
 17 “adequacy and typicality of the named plaintiffs” as to “absent class members whose grants were
 18 terminated” based on Executive Orders other than those named plaintiffs had established were responsible
 19 for their grant terminations. *Id.* at 52-53. The Court then conformed the class definition to the situation of
 20 named plaintiffs.

21 Similarly, the Court only included the three agencies where named plaintiffs were listed on grants
 22 in the class definition. *See id.* 59-60. This Court found that “Plaintiffs have not shown that any ‘mandatory’
 23 rule required the Other Agency Defendants to adopt a policy of issuing unreasoned form termination
 24 letters.” *Id.* at 59. “With respect to the First Amendment and APA contrary to law claims, Plaintiffs have
 25 not shown that the Other Agency Defendants were required to apply a common rule across the board to
 26 UC System grants with respect to the Equity Termination Orders.” *Id.* at 60.

Here, Plaintiffs seek to include all of HHS in the class definition—a sprawling, labyrinthian agency with over a dozen siloed, grantmaking components—but have provided only named plaintiffs listed on NIH grants. Even then Plaintiffs have only identified named plaintiffs on grants suspended in one discrete NIH suspension action. *See* 3rd PI Mot. at 5-9. That is not sufficient under both typicality and adequacy to include the over a dozen other components of HHS with entirely separate factual situations and different courses of conduct. *See Wolin*, 617 F.3d at 1175.

The lack of support for typicality and adequacy is illustrated by the situation with FDA, one HHS component. FDA was originally included in Plaintiffs' class definition but, upon factual discovery, was dropped because the named plaintiff's award was a services contract. *See* Pls.' Reply in Supp. 1st Preliminary Injunction at 4 n.4, ECF No. 41. Those developments are exactly why having a relevant named plaintiff is necessary to properly adjudicate an agency's amenability to class treatment. Fact-specific treatment of a particular grantmaking component, and a particular named plaintiff, helps to narrow the scope of litigation and determine whether a particular component is properly subject to an injunction.

That is not the only issue with including all of HHS. Plaintiffs have also entirely failed to show commonality across terminations at other HHS sub-agencies and the NIH suspension action. Indeed, Plaintiffs provide no factual material about terminations at other HHS sub-agencies at all. That glaring lack of detail bars Plaintiffs' omnibus inclusion of HHS in their proposed class definition.

All told, the Court should at the very least conclude that Plaintiffs have failed to meet their burden to show that all of HHS should be added to the proposed class definitions.

B. Typicality, Adequacy, and the Good Cause Finding for Modifying the Scheduling Order Limit the Class Definition to Just Grants Affected by the Suspension Letter

Next, Plaintiffs also fail typicality and adequacy as to earlier NIH terminations compared to the July 31 suspension. Each of the three named NIH plaintiffs were listed on grants affected by the NIH suspension letter. 3rd PI Mot. at 5-9. None alleges that they had a grant previously terminated. *Id.* And Plaintiffs do not provide the details of any individual grant termination by NIH prior to the NIH suspension letter. Indeed, Plaintiffs' entire class certification argument revolves around the "single NIH-UCLA" action. *Id.* at 11-15.

1 As a result, Plaintiffs have not satisfied the typicality and adequacy for pre-July 31 NIH
 2 terminations. No named plaintiff alleges a pre-July 31 action was taken for a grant listing them in a
 3 relevant position. And Plaintiffs do not provide any specific factual information detailing how a pre-July
 4 31 termination meets typicality, or how named plaintiffs satisfy adequacy for such a termination. It is
 5 Plaintiffs' burden to satisfy class certification. That they have failed to provide sufficient factual material
 6 in support defeats a broader application to NIH terminations.

7 Even if the typicality and adequacy inquiry did not bar pre-July 31 terminations, the Court's
 8 underlying good cause ruling should do exactly that. The Court found that Plaintiffs had good cause to
 9 amend their complaint to cover NIH because Plaintiffs planned to "alleg[e] injuries that occurred after the
 10 deadline for amended pleadings had passed," and "it does not seem . . . they could have anticipated what
 11 the form letter would have looked like in advance." Trans. (Aug. 26, 2025) 20:14-20:17.

12 The Court's ruling did not suggest that Plaintiffs would be able to include terminations using letters
 13 previously available to them. Indeed, the Court appeared to contemplate that good cause only applied
 14 because a new "form letter" was issued that Plaintiffs would not have been able to anticipate "in advance."
 15 *Id.* It was on that basis that the Court permitted amendment, and only on the basis set forth by Plaintiffs
 16 in the hearing. *Id.* 22:18-22:20 (holding that the Court would "grant Plaintiffs' motion to file an amended
 17 complaint along the lines that we discussed").

18 Accordingly, the Court should enforce its order permitting limited, specific amendment of the
 19 scheduling order. It should thus forbid Plaintiffs from including NIH terminations previously known to
 20 them.³

21 **C. The NIH UCLA Suspension Action is Not Common or Typical with the Termination
 22 Actions at DoD and DoT**

23 Moving to the commonality and typicality inquiry for the NIH suspension, the Court should deny
 24 Plaintiffs' proposed class (combining DoD, DoT, and HHS/NIH) because the single suspension letter is
 25 not common or typical with the terminations at DoD and DoT.

26
 27

³ The Court's order permitting modification of the scheduling for the limited purpose of adding
 28 the NIH suspension action should also bar Plaintiffs' broader appeal to include all of HHS in the class
 definition as opposed to just NIH.

1 The Court preliminarily certified the Equity Termination Class, which applies to “[a]ll grants
 2 terminated by Agency Defendants pursuant to Executive Orders 14151 or 14173.” Preliminary Injunction
 3 ¶ 4a. As the Court explained in its opinion, Executive Order 14151 directs “to the maximum extent allowed
 4 by law” termination of “*all . . . equity-related grants or contracts.*” Mem. Op. at 18 (quoting 90 Fed. Reg.
 5 8339, 8339 (Jan. 20, 2025)) (internal quotation marks omitted). And Executive Order 14173, as relevant,
 6 directs the termination of “*all diversity, equity, . . . and like . . . programs[] or activities.*” *Id.* (quoting 90
 7 Fed. Reg. 8633, 1634 (Jan. 21, 2025)) (internal quotation marks omitted). The Court found commonality
 8 and typicality as to the Equity Termination Class because defendants purportedly used similar grant-
 9 specific procedures that involved looking for terms such as “diversity, equity, and inclusion.” *Id.* at 54-
 10 55.

11 The Court certified the “Form Termination Class,” which covers terminations “communicated by
 12 means of a form termination notice that does not provide a grant-specific explanation for the termination
 13 that states the reason for the change to the original award decision and considers the reliance interests at
 14 stake.” Preliminary Injunction ¶ 2b. The Court found commonality and typicality as to the Form
 15 Termination Class because the named plaintiffs were subject to “*en masse* unreasoned termination of
 16 grants” which raised the common question of whether terminations by “form letters without any reasoned
 17 explanation, are arbitrary and capricious in violation of the APA.” Mem. Op. at 57-59.

18 Plaintiffs propose to apply both of those prior holdings to DoD, DoT, and HHS/NIH. 3rd PI Mot.
 19 at 10. Applying these definitions and findings here, commonality and typicality fail for both proposed
 20 classes on the details of the action.

21 Start with the Equity Termination Class. The NIH suspension letter cited “concerns reported and
 22 observed in UCLA programs” as the basis for suspending grants—not the DEIA-related Executive Orders
 23 identified by the Court. NIH Suspension Letter at 1. And the suspension letter explains that the action was
 24 based on a finding of discriminatory conduct by UCLA; it does not reference the content of any individual
 25 grant. *Id.* at 1-3. Meanwhile, the Court’s prior holding was based on a finding that the agencies improperly
 26 considered the content underlying a grant. Mem. Op. at 54-55. Plaintiffs argue the same for DoD and
 27 DoT—that the viewpoint of individual grants was the impetus for termination. 2nd PI Mot. at 16-18.
 28

1 Moreover, where part of the agency's justification is barring federal funds for discrimination in education,
 2 the First Amendment analysis is notably different compared to the grant-content-funding inquiry litigated
 3 prior to the injunction. *See, e.g., Bob Jones Univ. v. United States*, 461 U.S. 574, 604 (1983) (holding that
 4 the government has a "fundamental, overriding interest in eradicating racial discrimination in education").
 5 So the underlying First Amendment analysis differs across the various actions that would be covered by
 6 the Equity Termination Class.

7 All told, Plaintiffs have not met their burden to show that the NIH suspension action fits within
 8 the DoD, DoT, and HHS/NIH combined Equity Termination Class. Therefore, the Court should not add
 9 NIH to that proposed class definition.

10 The newly proposed Form Termination Class is similarly flawed. The NIH suspension letter is
 11 several pages long with detailed reasoning as to the basis for the suspension and citations to relevant
 12 sources. NIH Suspension Letter at 1-3. NIH identified UCLA-specific conduct that, in its view, authorized
 13 suspension. *Id.* NIH considered reliance interests. *Id.* at 3. This is substantially more detailed than DoD's
 14 letters, and even more than the already detailed DoT letters. As a result, NIH's action is sufficiently distinct
 15 as to preclude commonality and typicality with the other agencies in the newly proposed class.

16 Defendants acknowledge that Court has already ruled that it considers a suspension like the one
 17 set out by NIH as effectively acting as a termination. *See* Order RE NSF Suspensions at 10-11, ECF No.
 18 96. Nonetheless, Defendants reiterate their earlier objection to that finding. A suspension differs from a
 19 termination because it is a temporary change in the funding of a grant rather than the permanent cessation
 20 of the agreement. *See* Opp. Order Show Clause, ECF No. 86. Because the other actions in the proposed
 21 class are based on terminations, rather than suspensions, Plaintiffs have not met their burden for
 22 commonality and typicality, and their request to create a combined DoD, DoT, and HHS/NIH class should
 23 be denied. And Defendants maintain their original objections to a combined DoD and DoT class, including
 24 numerosity. Opp. 2nd PI Mot. at 10-13, ECF No. 86.

25 **III. Even Under the Court's Prior Reasoning, NIH Should Not be Enjoined**

26 Even accepting the Court's earlier reasoning, and class treatment, NIH should not be enjoined. The
 27 Form Termination Class does not apply because the APA does not foreclose the suspension. And the
 28

1 Equity Termination Class criteria is inapplicable to this suspension action premised on UCLA's conduct.

2 **A. The Form Termination Class Should Not Apply Here**

3 As to the Form Termination Class, the APA's committed to agency discretion by law exception
 4 bars APA review. Even if APA review is available, NIH's suspension letter is not arbitrary and capricious.

5 *NIH's Suspension was Committed to Agency Discretion by Law*

6 Withdrawal of funding is quintessential agency action "committed to agency discretion by law,"
 7 for which the APA does not provide an avenue for review. 5 U.S.C. § 701(a)(2). While the APA
 8 establishes a waiver of sovereign immunity and a cause of action for injunctive relief for parties adversely
 9 affected by either final agency action or an agency's failure to act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 702, 706(1)-(2), the waiver
 10 of sovereign immunity is limited. It does not apply in circumstances where "agency action is committed
 11 to agency discretion by law[,]" *id.* § 701(a)(2). Review under the APA therefore is unavailable "if the
 12 statute is drawn so that a court would have no meaningful standard against which to judge the agency's
 13 exercise of discretion." *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821, 830 (1985).

14 The Supreme Court has long recognized that an agency's determination of how to allocate
 15 appropriated funds among competing priorities and recipients—precisely what Plaintiffs challenge here—
 16 is classic discretionary agency action. *See Lincoln v. Vigil*, 508 U.S. 182, 193 (1993).

17 The Court previously rejected application of this exception, in large part, because of the agency
 18 statutes at issue. Mem. Op. at 34-35. NIH's statutory scheme, however, leave the agency with "the decision
 19 about how the moneys" for their program "could best be distributed." *See Milk Train, Inc. v. Veneman*,
 20 310 F.3d 747, 751 (D.C. Cir. 2002). Such decisions "clearly require[] a complicated balancing of a number
 21 of factors which are peculiarly within [the agency's] expertise." *Id.* at 752 (citations omitted). As a result,
 22 the grant funding decisions are committed to the agencies' discretion.

23 Start with the basics. NIH and its constituent institutes make grants to fund research at universities,
 24 hospitals, laboratories, and other research institutions. *See* 42 U.S.C. 241(a)(1), 284(b)(1)-(2). Congress
 25 supports that research via lump-sum appropriations. For example, in 2024 Congress appropriated \$6.5
 26 billion for the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases to carry out the Public Health Service
 27 Act "with respect to allergy and infectious diseases." Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024, Pub.

1 L. No. 118-47, Div. D, Tit. II, 138 Stat. 656; *see* Full-Year Continuing Appropriations and Extensions
 2 Act, 2025, § 1101(a)(8), Pub L. No. 119-4, 139 Stat. 11 (carrying forward HHS's 2024 appropriation into
 3 2025).

4 NIH's choices in how to allocate that money are discretionary. The Secretary of HHS, in broad
 5 terms, is directed to "encourage, cooperate with, and render assistance to other appropriate public
 6 authorities, scientific institutions, and scientists in the conduct of, and promote the coordination of,
 7 research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and studies relating to the causes, diagnosis,
 8 treatment, control, and prevention of physical and mental diseases and impairments of man." 42 U.S.C.
 9 §241(a). But that does not direct any particular funding decision. Indeed, by statute, NIH "may" provide
 10 support "through grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements." *See* 42 U.S.C. 284(b)(2).

11 Nothing in the portions of the statute directing the irregular creation of strategic plans cabin this
 12 discretion. 42 U.S.C. § 282(m). The scheme does not make such plans binding for all future funding
 13 decisions. *See id.* So the fact that prior strategic plans reference certain priorities does not provide law to
 14 apply here. *Contra* 3rd PI Mot. at 18-19 (suggesting that strategic plans are *sub silentio* incorporated by
 15 reference into the statute and therefore any funding decision potentially conflicting with a plan violates
 16 statutory authority).

17 Lump sum appropriations are precisely what the Supreme Court in *Lincoln* determined was
 18 committed to agency discretion by law. *Lincoln*, 508 U.S. at 193. And the other uses of discretionary
 19 language set forth precisely the "complicated balancing of a number of factors" that takes a funding
 20 decision out of APA review. *See id.* Nor does the statute mandate any particular grant on any particular
 21 topic be approved and maintained.

22 The fact that a regulation provides for *termination* in accordance with agency priorities does not
 23 limit this discretion. *See* 2 C.F.R. § 200.340. First, there has been no termination by regulation here, merely
 24 a suspension permitted by NIH's own regulation. NIH Suspension Letter at 1-3. Indeed, NIH's regulation
 25 specifically permits NIH to "[w]holly or partly suspend (suspension of award activities) or terminate the
 26 Federal award" for the reasons identified in its letter. 45 C.F.R. § 75.371(c).

27 Putting that to the side, "the proper ordering of [agency] priorities" is precisely what the Supreme
 28

1 Court in *Lincoln* emphasized as being squarely committed to agency discretion by law in the funding
 2 context. 508 U.S. at 193 (citation omitted). And the mere creation of contractual obligation of lump-sum
 3 funding cannot suddenly provide “law to apply” for purposes of defeating this exception. To the extent
 4 any such law is generated, it is contractual, an area of law placed within the sphere of the Court of Federal
 5 Claims and outside this Court’s review. *See supra* Part I. And even if the Court were to conclude that it
 6 could review NIH’s compliance with its own regulations, Plaintiffs have not set forth any reason to think
 7 NIH has violated 45 C.F.R. § 75.371 and any accompanying procedures.

8 NIH’s suspension action is not subject to APA review at all and the Form Termination Class fails
 9 as to NIH. At the very least, the broad statutory discretion means the Court can only provide very limited
 10 review tied solely to compliance with regulation—which NIH satisfied.

11 *NIH’s Suspension was not Arbitrary and Capricious*

12 The arbitrary and capricious standard “requires that agency action be reasonable and reasonably
 13 explained.” *FCC*, 592 U.S. at 423. “Judicial review under that standard is deferential, and a court may not
 14 substitute its own policy judgment for that of the agency.” *Id.*

15 Even if this Court can review the merits of Plaintiffs’ claim, NIH’s detailed suspension letter
 16 satisfies the arbitrary and capricious framework.

17 First, NIH’s suspension letter made specific factual findings as to UCLA and informed the
 18 institution that NIH was willing to work with UCLA to resolve these concerns and facilitate corrective
 19 action. NIH Suspension Letter at 1-3. The letter identified several “specific examples of noncompliance”:
 20 (1) “illegal race-based preferences in admissions practices;” (2) “fail[ure] to promote a research
 21 environment free of antisemitism and bias;” and (3) “discriminat[ion] against and endanger[ing] women
 22 by allowing men in women’s sports and private women-only spaces.” *Id.* NIH subsequently dedicated a
 23 paragraph to each identified example of noncompliance with cited sources. *Id.* For example, NIH cited
 24 “UCLA’s own Task Force to Combat Antisemitism and Anti-Israeli Bias” which, NIH explained,
 25 “revealed that Jewish students, faculty, and staff were subjected to threats, assaults, swastika graffiti, and
 26 hostile slogans during the 2024 pro-Palestinian encampment.” *Id.* at 2. This detailed statement of

1 reasoning suffices to show that NIH's choice to suspend was "reasonable and reasonably explained." *See*
 2 *FCC*, 592 U.S. at 423.

3 Second, the agency explicitly considered reliance interests. NIH Suspension Letter at 3. NIH stated
 4 that it "has considered UCLA's reliance interests in continued availability of funding under the attached
 5 list of grants, and they are outweighed by the concerns identified." *Id.* Nothing more is required. The
 6 grantee was always on notice that funding could be suspended based on the terms and conditions of the
 7 grant or violation of federal law. *See Smiley v. Citibank (S. Dakota)*, 517 U.S. 735, 742 (1996) (requiring
 8 agencies to consider "legitimate reliance"). NIH informed the grantee, UCLA, that it had considered its
 9 reliance interests but found the underlying violations sufficient to overcome those interests. NIH
 10 Suspension Letter at 3. As a result, reliance interests do not overcome NIH's substantial findings and
 11 explanation. *See, e.g., Am. Med. Ass'n v. Reno*, 57 F.3d 1129, 1134 (D.C. Cir. 1995) (discussing how the
 12 need to explain varies with context).

13 **B. NIH's Suspension is Also Outside the Equity Termination Class**

14 The Equity Termination Class is similarly inapplicable. First, assuming APA review is permitted,
 15 Plaintiffs do not succeed under APA contrary-to-law review. Second, NIH's suspension letter explains
 16 that its actions were aimed at UCLA's noncompliance, not the content of any grant.

17 *Plaintiffs Have Not Shown NIH's Actions Were Contrary to Law Under the APA*

18 Plaintiffs first cite the Impoundment Control Act ("ICA"). Under that Act, appropriated funds
 19 "shall be made available for obligation" unless the President transmits a special message to Congress and
 20 Congress rescinds the appropriation. 2 U.S.C. § 683(b). The Act enforces Congress's power over the purse
 21 in relation to the Executive. *See Dabney v. Reagan*, 542 F. Supp. 756, 760 (S.D.N.Y. 1982). It provides
 22 for enforcement by the Comptroller General (an official in the Legislative Branch), but does not include
 23 private enforcement. The statute is thus generally not enforceable through an APA suit. *Glob. Health*
 24 *Council v. Trump*, No. 25-5097, 2025 WL 2480618, at *1 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 28, 2025); *cf. Trump v. Sierra*
 25 *Club*, 140 S. Ct. 1 (2019); *id.* at 1 (Breyer, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part) (noting that the
 26 majority had stayed a lower court order "rais[ing] novel and important questions about the ability of
 27 private parties to enforce Congress' appropriations power").

1 But even if the ICA were enforceable, the suspension of grants is not an impoundment within the
 2 meaning of the Act. As the D.C. Circuit has explained, withholding funds within the bounds of a statutory
 3 or regulatory program does not qualify as an impoundment or a failure to make funds “available for
 4 obligation” under the statute. *See City of New Haven v. United States*, 809 F.2d 900, 907 (D.C. Cir. 1987)
 5 (explaining how Congress has previously acknowledged that “the executive branch necessarily withholds
 6 funds on hundreds of occasions during the course of a fiscal year” and such delays may result from the
 7 “normal and orderly operation of the government” (quoting H.R. Rep. No. 658, 93-658, 93d Cong., 1st
 8 Sess. 41 (1971), *reprinted in* 1974 U.S.C. Cong. & Admin. News 3462, 3486-87). Indeed, the alternative
 9 would be startling. If any suspension of a contract violated the ICA, the Federal Government would be
 10 entirely disabled from ever reordering its funding affairs, or even cutting off funding to entities committing
 11 fraud, that have gone bankrupt, or any of the myriad instances where agencies must redirect funding. That
 12 is not what the ICA requires, and accordingly, Defendants have not violated it.

13 Plaintiffs next argue that the governing NIH statutory scheme bars NIH’s action because 42 U.S.C.
 14 § 282(m) requires irregular generation of strategic plans for NIH. 3rd PI Mot. at 17-19. But, as discussed
 15 previously, nothing in the statutory scheme makes those plans binding for all future funding decisions. So
 16 there is nothing contrary to “law” about any purported conflict between NIH’s suspension action and the
 17 plan. And even setting that aside, Plaintiffs have not shown that it is contrary to the strategic plan generally
 18 to suspend grants to a specific grantee based on detailed findings that the grantee has facilitated
 19 discrimination or violated federal law. *See* NIH Suspension Letter at 1-3. By Plaintiffs’ logic, a grantee
 20 found to have stolen every dollar of funding would be immunized from suspension for any grants related
 21 to the active strategic plan. That makes little sense and is ultimately not the law.

22 *NIH’s Letter Did Not Rely on DEIA-Related Executive Orders or Grant Content*

23 Finally, Plaintiffs have not shown that NIH relied on the content of any grant in its UCLA
 24 suspension action. Instead, the letter invoked UCLA’s actions determining that suspension was warranted
 25 based on specific conduct by the grantee. NIH Suspension Letter at 1. NIH accordingly concluded that
 26 suspension was required to “ensure compliance with applicable federal statutes and regulations, and the
 27 terms and conditions of these Federal awards.” *Id.*

1 In order to fit this action into the Equity Termination Class, Plaintiffs argue the suspension was
 2 “based on DEI-related viewpoints HHS attributes to UCLA and imputes to its researchers.” 3rd PI Mot.
 3 at 16. Plaintiffs provide no basis for this imputation claim and it does not fit the plain text of the relevant
 4 letter. NIH’s actions are directly tied to specific activities at UCLA. NIH did not reference any viewpoint
 5 in any grant, nor is there any indication that the DEIA content of any grant was the basis for these
 6 suspensions. Indeed, the whole stated purpose of the suspension is that it was categorical to UCLA
 7 generally, regardless of the content of specific grants. NIH Suspension Letter at 1-3. Nor do the grants
 8 listed by the NIH named plaintiffs suggest some kind of focus on DEIA content. *See* 3rd PI Mot. at 5-9.

9 Plaintiffs have not shown that NIH is “deliberately penalizing certain ‘dangerous ideas,’” of the
 10 kind the Court found convincing in issuing its original injunction. Mem. Op. at 18; *see also id.* at 19
 11 (“Defendants terminated pre-existing grants *en masse* across the federal government for touching on
 12 prohibited topics.”). And even if all that were not true, NIH has substantial discretion under the First
 13 Amendment to ensure that it is not funding discriminatory behavior in educational environments. *See Bob*
 14 *Jones Univ.*, 461 U.S. at 604. Plaintiffs have not demonstrated that this overriding federal interest has been
 15 overcome.

16 Finally, Defendants reiterate that the lack of evidence suggesting that suspensions were based on
 17 the content of the grants defeats standing as well. The Court concluded previously that standing was proper
 18 because, “Plaintiffs are exactly the individuals whom the First Amendment and the APA aim to protect.
 19 They are the ones who engaged in the protected speech, and their research is the target of the unreasoned
 20 arbitrary termination of funding.” Mem. Op. at 44. That is not the case here for the First Amendment
 21 claim. Other than Plaintiffs’ imputation argument, for which it provides no basis, Plaintiffs concede that
 22 any First Amendment rights would belong to UCLA. 3rd PI Mot. at 16. But Plaintiffs do not explain why
 23 Plaintiffs should be able to assert any First Amendment right belonging to UCLA. *See Kowalski*, 543 U.S.
 24 at 129. Thus, at the very least in this distinct scenario involving this suspension of grants to UCLA
 25 premised on UCLA’s conduct, Plaintiffs lack standing to bring their First Amendment claim.

26 **IV. Injunctive Relief Should Be Stayed Pending Appeal and Be Accompanied by a Bond**

27 To the extent the Court expands injunctive relief, Defendants respectfully request that such relief

1 be stayed pending the disposition of any appeal that is authorized by the Solicitor General, or at a
 2 minimum, administratively stayed for a period of seven days to allow the United States to seek an
 3 emergency, expedited stay from the court of appeals if an appeal is authorized.

4 Defendants also respectfully request that any additional injunctive relief accompany a bond under
 5 Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(c), which provides that “[t]he court may issue a preliminary injunction or a temporary
 6 restraining order only if the movant gives security in an amount that the court considers proper to pay the
 7 costs and damages sustained by any party found to have been wrongfully enjoined or restrained.” A bond
 8 is appropriate here given that any preliminary relief would potentially mandate that the Executive spend
 9 money that may be lost forever once distributed. *California*, 145 S. Ct. at 969.

10 **CONCLUSION**

11 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that the Court deny Plaintiffs’ motion
 12 for a preliminary injunction as to HHS, or at the very least that the Court limit it to just NIH and
 13 to only those UC researchers listed on grants subject to the July 31 suspension action.

14
 15 DATED: September 10, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

16 BRETT A. SHUMATE
 17 Assistant Attorney General
 18 Civil Division

ERIC J. HAMILTON
 Deputy Assistant Attorney General

JOSEPH E. BORSON
 Assistant Branch Director

/s/ Jason Altabet

JASON ALTABET (Md. Bar No. 2211280012)
 Trial Attorney, U.S. Department of Justice
 Tel.: (202) 305-0727
 Email: jason.k.altabet2@usdoj.gov

KATHRYN BARRAGAN (D.C. Bar No. 90026294)
 Trial Attorney, U.S. Department of Justice
 Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
 1100 L Street, N.W.
 Washington, D.C. 20005

FED. DEFS.’ OPP’N TO PLS.’ MOT. FOR ADDITIONAL PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AS TO NIH
 CASE NO. 25-CV-4737

1 Tel.: (202) 598-7696
2 Email: kathryn.e.barragan@usdoj.gov

3 *Attorneys for the United States*